

## REMARKS

The application includes claims 1-27 prior to entering this amendment.

The examiner rejected claims 1-8 and 15-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The examiner indicated that claims 1 and 15 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Claims 9-14 and 25-27 are allowed.

Applicant amends claims 1, 8 and 15 to obviate the Section 112 rejections.

The application remains with claims 1-27 after entering this amendment.

The applicant traverses the rejections, adds no new matter and requests reconsideration.

### Section 112, Second Paragraph Claim Rejections

#### A. Claim 1-8

Preliminarily, the applicant notes that the examiner refers to the illustrative embodiment shown in the drawings in the explanation of the Section 112 grounds for rejection. Such references are convenient for discussion but applicant would point out that the scope of the claims should not be determined by or limited to the embodiment(s) shown in the drawing.

The examiner asserts that claim 1 is indefinite with regard to the limitation, [using the identifier] “to determine the location of the routing information in the routing table.”<sup>1</sup> The examiner remarked that, “A received packet appears to be received from an ingress port, i.e., ingress port 78-fig.3/fig.8, and proceeding toward an egress port 94-fig.3/fig.8....” However, the examiner apparently found the claim indefinite as to “which side” (presumably, of the network access server) received the packet. And finally, the examiner observed that which *type* of packet (e.g., L2TP control, PPP, signaling, data, etc.) is being processed was not specified. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Taking the last point first, no limitation is intended as to the specific type of packet processed in the claimed methodology, nor would such a limitation be appropriate. Rather, the

---

<sup>1</sup> Office action, page 2.

specification makes it clear that various different types of packets can all be processed as described. For example, in one embodiment, a packet classifier 222 of a distribution engine 220 (Fig. 8) first determines the type of received packet, and then uses the packet type to perform a search for a corresponding routing table entry.<sup>2</sup> (Claim 5 speaks to sub-classifying the packet.)

Second, as to “which side” received the packet, the disclosed access server of course operates bidirectionally. Both the “Ingress Ports” and the “Egress Ports” are bidirectional (albeit not at the same time). See FIGS. 3, 5, 7, 8 etc.<sup>3</sup> As illustrated in FIG. 1, the *ingress* side generally indicates the PSTN side of a server, while *egress* refers to the IP network side, but traffic moves in both directions as is known. Therefore, the claim term, “a received packet” should not be presumed to mean only a packet received at an *ingress* port. Packets are also received at *egress* ports.<sup>4</sup>

The method of claim 1 is associated with processing a packet received at an egress port. The claim is amended to remove any ambiguity. (Note that claim 8 recites, “The method of claim 1, wherein the routing table identifier indicates the ingress port to which the second processor should route the data in the received packet.” This is consistent with having first received the packet at an egress port.)

For the foregoing reasons, the rejection of claims 1-8 under Section 112 should be withdrawn. Claim 1 was indicated allowable if amended to overcome the Section 112 rejection. Accordingly, claims 1-8 should now be allowed.

## B. Claims 15-24

---

<sup>2</sup> Specification at page 22, lines 1-11.

<sup>3</sup> FIG. 9 shows processing of a packet received at an *egress* port and output via an *ingress* port.

<sup>4</sup> See Specification at pages 5-6. For example, “where user downloads typically predominate over user uploads, the egress port may receive significantly more than half of the overall packets received. Were a single forwarding engine deployed for all packets received at the egress port, this engine would in all probability have to perform packet processing on over half of all packets traversing the access server, once again compromising the scalability of the architecture.”

“This potential egress port bottleneck is also addressed by the disclosed embodiments. Line cards preferably not only perform packet processing and forwarding for data received at the *ingress* ports they serve—each line card also performs packet processing and forwarding for packets received at the *egress* port but bound for the ingress ports served by that card.” Specification at page 6, lines 6-10.

Claim 15 also is amended to recite, in pertinent part, “for a ~~received~~ packet received at an egress port...” This amendment removes any ambiguity and thus obviates the Section 112 rejection. Since claim 15 was indicated as otherwise allowable, claims 15-24 should now be allowed.

### **Conclusion**

Claims 9-14 and 25-27 were previously allowed, so this case is now in condition for allowance in its entirety. The applicants encourage the examiner to telephone the undersigned at (503) 224-2170 if any issues remain.

**Customer No. 73552**

Respectfully submitted,

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP

/MICAH D. STOLOWITZ/

---

Micah D. Stolorwitz  
Reg. No. 32,758

STOLOWITZ FORD COWGER LLP  
621 SW Morrison Street, Suite 600  
Portland, OR 97205  
(503) 224-2170